DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 432 RC 008 561

TITLE	Progress Report on Rural Development for Fiscal Year 1970.
INSTITUTION	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	2 Oct 70
NOTE	21p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Role; Agricultural Research Projects; *Annual Reports; Cooperative Programs; Electricity; Extension Education; Federal Government; Forestry; Industrialization; Interagency Coordination; Job Development; *Organization; *Program Descriptions; *Rural Development; Soil Conservation; *State Agencies
IDENTIFIERS	*Department of Agriculture; USDA

ABSTRACT

Rural development progress relative to State-U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) committees is presented via exemplary citation in this 1970 report. Summaries are given for: (1) Status of State-USDA Organization for Rural Development, (2) Functional Relationships of USDA Committees on Rural Development, (3) Activities and Projects Underway, (4) Generalized Rural Trends. Exemplary State progress reports are presented for Alabama (industrialization); Arkansas (job development); Arizona (job increases); Kentucky and Iowa (industrialization and job creation); Maryland (housing, public facilities, and recreation); and Vermont ("creative localism"). Exemplary agency activities are cited for (1) Agricultural Research Service (a new Agribusiness and Rural Living Program); (2) Extension Service (a garbage disposal program and various beautification projects); (3) Farmer Cooperative Service (a feasibility study on flower growing in Georgia); (4) Farmers Home Administration (development of a water system in Derby Center, Vermont); (5) Forest Service (expansion of Pennsylvania's timber based industries); (6) Rural Electrification Administration (a feasibility study on a North Dakota malting barley plant); (7) Soil Conservation Service (catfish production increases in Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana). (JC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Rite
Riders

ED107432

Progress Report

on RURAL DEVELOPMENT

for Fiscal Year 1970

U. S. Department of Agriculture

RC008561

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

October 2, 1970

Honorable Clifford M. Hardin
Secretary of Agriculture

Dear Mr. Secretary:

It is my privilege to present you with this report of progress in the Department's rural development effort, in accordance with Secretary's Memorandum No. 1667.

The report, for the most part, focuses on the development efforts within USDA. In this regard it should be noted that the rural development expenditures of agencies of this Department reached an estimated $1.7 billion during fiscal year 1970. It is estimated the total will move up to $2.5 billion in FY 1971 with the largest proportion of this increase going into the insured housing program. This is nearly a billion dollars above expenditures for FY 1969. This level of expenditures is bound to have a pronounced economic impact and stimulate a significant number of regions into greater local effort.

It is recognized that effective rural development requires more than the programs of this Department. And while it is not spelled out in this report, there is developing across government a good working relationship between USDA and the other Federal Departments on delivery of programs to rural areas.

The report for the fiscal year just ended shows progress, but all who are concerned with rural development recognize that a great deal remains to be accomplished. The progress which we have enjoyed and that which will be accomplished in the future depends, essentially, upon the efforts of millions of individuals united in team effort.

Your continued wise counsel and leadership is essential and much appreciated.

Sincerely,

T. K. Cowden

T. K. COWDEN
Assistant Secretary

0003

PROGRESS REPORT ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

Introduction

As the modern concept of rural development in America continues to evolve from its early stages of the 1950's, Fiscal Year 1970 was a year of marked progress.

Soon after the year began--on September 29, 1969--the President appointed a blue ribbon Task Force on Rural Development. Its charge called for a "...review of the effectiveness of present rural assistance programs, and make recommendations as to what might be done in the private and public sectors to stimulate rural development." The Task Force transmitted its final report -- "A New Life for the Country" -- to the President January 12, 1970.

The President issued Executive Order 11493 establishing a Council for Rural Affairs November 6, 1969. The Council included the Vice-President, six cabinet members, Directors of the Bureau of the Budget and Office of Economic Opportunity and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors. Its function was to advise and assist the President with respect to the further development of the non-metropolitan areas of the country.

Accepting a major responsibility for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary Hardin on November 7, 1969, issued Secretary's Memorandum No. 1667, outlining an organizational structure designed to meet that responsibility. Emphasizing the critical role of local organizations, groups, and leaders the memorandum established a Departmental Rural Development Committee and directed the establishment of State-USDA Rural Development Committees. The Departmental Committee consisted of the Economic Research Service, Extension Service, Farmers Home Administration, Forest Service, Rural Electrification Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. Other agency representatives were to serve from time to time as the need indicated. State-USDA Committees would include representatives of the agencies specified above plus representatives of other Federal agencies and departments and State agencies as deemed appropriate by the respective State committees.

In January 1970 appropriate agencies developed and issued suggested guidelines for the organization and operation of the USDA Committees for Rural Development at State, district, and local levels. The Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and agency administrators held regional meetings throughout the country for State representatives of the five agencies. At these meetings the mission and responsibility of the Department were discussed and clarified.

At the same time, greater responsibility for interdepartmental liaison was assigned to the various agencies of the Department, based on similarity of programs.

The following is a summary of progress and status of the rural development effort as of June 30, 1970. The status is reported under four categories. The summary is compiled from reports submitted by the State-USDA Rural Development Committees. The Committees were given broad latitude in what they reported. Therefore, the statistics presented on the status and activity represent only a partial report on rural development work underway. To consider them as anything other than an indicator of the diversity of the needs of people in rural areas and activity to fill these needs, in effect sells short the tremendous interest and effort of both the department and citizens groups.

I. Status of State-USDA Organization for Rural Development
(See Table I)

Fifty States reported that a State-USDA Committee has been organized in accord with Secretary's Memorandum No. 1667. Five Departmental agencies -- CES, FHA, FS, REA, and SCS -- are represented on 49 of the State-USDA Committees. Thirty-nine of the State committees include representatives of other USDA agencies. Twelve committees include representatives of Federal agencies and Departments outside the USDA, and 32 include representatives of State agencies. Sixteen committees include representatives of other (than Cooperative Extension Service) departments of the State land grant university. Twenty-two State-USDA Committees have organized Area-USDA Committees on Rural Development with representation from State and Federal agencies.

Thirty-two States have County-USDA committees on Rural Development. Three States limited membership on the committees to representatives of Federal agencies. Seventeen States include representatives of both State agencies and county governments on the County-USDA Committees.

II. Functional Relationships of USDA Committees on Rural Development (See Table II)

In general, USDA Committees on Rural Development have established relationships at different levels of government within the States. Forty-one work with the State development and/or planning agency; 38 have established channels of relationships with the Governors' offices; 23 with area or district bodies; and 32 with county government bodies.

These relationships range from interlocking memberships, official liaison, to informal reviews of mutual concerns and projects. There is evidence of many jointly sponsored projects between the USDA Committees and other governmental groups at all levels. In some instances, the State-USDA Committee on Rural Development has served as a catalytic agent in the establishment of a Governor's Rural Development Committee or Council.

USDA Committees on Rural Development at all three levels have established relationships with citizen committees interested in Rural Development. Twenty-two States have complementary relationship and formal channels of communications with State level citizens committees; 23 have similar relationship at the area or district level; and 29 at the county level.

During 1970 State and local government officials and citizen leaders established and put into operation an increasing number of multi-county agencies to perform a variety of planning and development activities. There are now some 600 such agencies in existence, a 20 percent increase over the number for 1969. These serve jurisdictions that may vary in size from less than one county to 10 counties or more.

As States and localities form an increasing number of multi-county agencies, the Department of Agriculture and the Cooperative Extension Services of the States are stepping up their assistance as a principal method of implementing Rural Development. Multi-county agencies offer such advantages as sufficient population and resources to assure economies of scale in development operations; permit the smallest rural municipality or county to obtain many of the technical and administrative services available to cities and urban areas; and serve as a bridge between the planning and action stages of program implementation.

III. Activities and Projects Underway (See Table III)

Many State Committees did not provide information on activities and projects underway. However, the number responding gives a good indication of the broad range of concerns and activities and the tremendous amount of activity in this area.

The States providing information reported 56 instances of activity relating to or enhancing economic development; 81 instances relating to establishment of public facilities and/or services; 32 instances of activity to involve citizens in public decision; and 13 on special projects for low-income families.

Data supplied were categorized under four stages of progress: identified as a need; under study, discussion or organization stage for action; implementation underway; and action completed. Types of activity were categorized under 16 headings. The types of activity and numbers of States reporting action at one or more of the developmental stages are: new industrial plants, 14; job training, 10; industrial expansion, 13; service industries, 5; new markets or expansion, 8; water and sewage projects, 17; health facilities and/or services, 12; recreation facilities and/or services, 16; housing projects, 20; planning and zoning, 17; educational programs, 11; inventories of economic and human resources, 6; multi-county planning bodies, 15; transportation, 5; and special low-income projects, 13.

There is evidence pointing to more emphasis in the future to be placed on those activities and projects which require a concerted effort of many agencies and groups in addition to those that can be achieved by each agency alone.

IV. Generalized Rural Trends

Only a few States provided statistics pointing to significant trends. However, these were sufficient to indicate directions. Generally States reported increasing population, a continued shift of employment from agriculture and rural areas to population and industrial centers, and increased total employment.

Despite the fact that population continues to shift, numerous States reported increased job opportunities in rural areas, indicating that the migration from rural to urban centers may be decreasing. The extent to which this is true could not be ascertained. In spite of increased unemployment, nearly all States reported increased total employment. Some reported a shift from discontinued jobs to other alternatives and jobs newly created. The steady increase in the work force also helps to explain increasing total employment occurring at the same time the percent of people unemployed was increasing.

V. Selected Examples of Rural Development Progress

Alabama reports considerable progress in industrialization in rural areas. The State Chamber of Commerce indicated that 128 new industries were constructed in 1969. These provided nearly 14,000 jobs with 9,000 of them located in predominantly rural areas.

In addition, assistance was provided in the creation of 111 community facility and service projects, and in 62 recreation projects; 52 loans and grants helped provide water and sewer services to 12,127 families, while others provided housing for 3,563 families.

Arkansas reported major progress in job development. The Weyerhauser expansion now under development will provide 1,600 new jobs. Four new plants established recently provide 1,125 jobs. In one district alone 3,200 new jobs have been created in addition to numerous housing, water and sewage projects. Arkansas has the nation's first family cooperative housing project at Poplar Grove. Personal income in 1968, the last year for which figures were available, was 8.3 percent higher than in 1967. Agricultural employment has shown a modest increase since 1967. The Ouachita and Ozark regions have experienced considerable industrial and population growth since 1960.

Arizona reports an increase in jobs of 4,075 in three counties in 1969. These occurred in electronics, metal fabricating plants, and government employment located in predominantly rural counties. The USDA-State Committee works closely with the State Department of Economic Planning and Development in industrialization and job creation projects. Construction of one sewer system, two water systems and one flood control project were completed.

Kentucky perhaps compiled the most notable record in industrial development and job creation. Industrial development and expansion created 7,000 new jobs in the first 9 months of 1969. It is estimated that 9,000 jobs were created during the entire year. Twenty-five new plant openings were reported in non-metropolitan areas, 6 new mine openings and 16 plant expansions. Seven new plants in the Appalachian region signaled a real breakthrough.

The correlation of job opportunities to trained personnel was evident in Kentucky, as more than 12,000 of the 14,000 persons who completed Manpower Development and Training programs were placed in jobs.

Also in Kentucky 52 water systems and 17 sewer systems were either initiated, completed, or received major improvement in the last year. At least 14 hospitals were approved, under construction or completed during the past year, and six nursing homes built in non-metropolitan areas. Eleven housing projects were started or finished in non-metropolitan areas. Included in these were 734 FHA home loans. At least 35 community recreation projects were in process or completed during the year. Many were financed, in part, by Bureau of Outdoor Recreation funds.

Iowa reports new capital investment in plants of $209 million for 1969. This was involved in 245 new plants and expansion that created more than 11,000 new jobs.

There were 185 plant expansions, 23 new industries and 37 branch plants constructed or relocated. Iowa's non-farm employment reached a new high of 875,000. The total work force is 1.2 million. Average unemployment in 1969 was only 2.7 percent and current unemployment is at the 3.7 percent level.

Maryland has been especially active in housing, public facility and recreation projects.

For 1970, FHA housing loans exceed $12 million; association water and sewer loans either underway or obligated exceed $5.5 million; watershed projects $306,700 with an additional $769,700 approved for FY'70; and recreation loans exceeding $497,000. An additional 16 water and sewer projects have been authorized but not funded.

Arrangements have been completed for a major optical manufacturing firm to locate a facility in Maryland. Initially it will employ several hundred people and within a short time expand employment to a few thousand. Many Departmental agencies as well as State agencies were instrumental in obtaining this facility.

The USDA Committee is involved now in developing a proposal for a Sea Grant program for the University of Maryland and other cooperating agencies. This is expected to have a major impact on the rural areas of the State because of the sizable sport and commercial fisheries industry.

Vermont has shown great interest in "creative localism" and feels that the rural development program will do much to assist local people in developing programs to meet their needs.

There are interlocking relationships and joint memberships between the USDA Committee and the Vermont Office of Local Affairs, State Office of Economic Opportunity, CAMPS Committee, and Vermont Council for the Aging.

Activities and projects underway include manpower training, housing and community facilities, environmental improvement, waste management programs, and improvement in local governments. Over 400 units of housing have been built or authorized through the Vermont Housing Authority and 646 advances have been made by FHA for rural housing including 10 for rental housing.

VI. Examples of Agencies' Activities in Rural Development

Agricultural Research Service. A new Agribusiness and Rural Living Program is being created in the Agricultural Research Service to give broadened assistance in planning and establishing profitmaking enterprises.

This new ARS program continues and increases its cooperative assistance to solving major problems in eight economic development regions: Appalachia, Coastal Plains, Four-Corners, New England, Ozarks, Upper Great Lakes, U.S.-Mexico Border, and Puerto Rico.

The ARS group has found that the key to solving these regional problems is to join forces with other Federal and State groups to assist the individual States.

Here are some examples of current ARS assistance in these economic development regions:

--Technical and market development to exploit pine stumpage in four Southwestern States (at least $50 million in products and more than 200 jobs, about half for Indians.)

--Investigations to improve marketing facilities and practices for apples in the Four-Corners region (over 300 small farmers, including many Spanish-American and Indians)

--Feasibility study to improve feed, livestock, and livestock products outlook in the Southwest (exceeding $1 billion in products annually.)

--Planning and establishing a community cannery to serve Spanish-Americans in southern Colorado.

--Development of a mechanical harvester for broomcorn, applicable to three economic development regions (to save a nationwide $25 million industry and employment for hundreds, many of whom are Negroes and blind people.)

Extension Service. Countywide garbage disposal was a problem in Calhoun County, Alabama, but not any more. The problem was pointed out at an Extension Service Council meeting in February 1968. Someone said, "Let's get the ball rolling," and the county commissioners said the county would defray the expense.

A three-phase plan of action was developed: an educational program led by Extension; county government providing facilities for garbage collection and disposal; and a countywide cleanup campaign.

"Now," said County Extension Chairman A.S. Mathews, "every rural household in this county has a container within 3 miles where they can empty their household garbage. The 'sore eye' spots along the roadsides where people once emptied their garbage have been eliminated, too."

Located throughout the county are 45 containers--each holding 8 cubic yards--for people to use in emptying household garbage. The County Commission signed a contract with a private sanitation company to empty the containers. Garbage is hauled to existing city dumps.

Based on the amount of garbage picked up--half a million gallons a month--it is estimated that half of the county's 105,000 rural people are using the service.

There have been several other helpful effects of this program. An educational program was conducted to make people aware of keeping the county clean. Children in the 30 county schools got 25,000 people to sign a commitment that they would not throw out litter. Each city in the county and the State Highway Department also put on litter collection campaigns. The State Highway Department in the county conducted a special campaign to clean up sides of highways. Beautification projects are also being planned in rural communities.

This program has brought the county's rural and urban people closer together by encouraging them to cooperate to make their area more livable.

Farmer Cooperative Service. A feasibility study on flower growing in a nine-county area in the "heart" of Georgia showed excellent possibilities. Thus the idea: to involve low-income people, train them in a central greenhouse location, and then help them finance greenhouses, produce flowers, and sell through a cooperative.

The Heart of Georgia Area Planning and Development Commission initiated the program. Several Federal and State agencies were involved in the initial funding, including USDA's Farmer's Home Administration, Farmer Cooperative Service, and Extension Service.

Forty people, both black and white, are receiving training in a 17-week Labor Department course on growing flowers. They meet at the 4-H Club Center in Dublin, Georgia. After the course, they will return to their homes to begin production. FHA is providing Economic Opportunity funds and supervision to the new greenhouse farmers.

Farmer Cooperative Service is doing the economic feasibility analysis of the proposed greenhouse supply-marketing cooperative for a 5-year period. This will determine loan and grant requirements for the cooperative. FCS will also conduct a management seminar for the board and management.

It is hoped that by the third year the cooperative will have gross sales of $4 million a year, resulting in an increased net family income of $4,000 a year for each of the 120 or more members.

Farmers Home Administration. A few years ago when the water supply for Derby Center, Vermont, (present population 450) was condemned. the citizens were faced with a real problem. The 80-year-old water system provided an inadequate supply. The water quality was so poor that when the water table reached a certain level, the water could not be used for human consumption without boiling. In addition to homes, two schools with a combined student population of more than 600 used the system.

The townspeople got busy. They hired an engineer. Through the county FHA office, they received a loan and grant to build a new system and extend lines to 30 families not previously served. The State of Vermont provided an additional grant. The new system was designed to take care of anticipated growth for the foreseeable future, and also allows for improved fire protection.

A new water supply had to be developed for the new system. In addition, 20,000 feet of crumbling pipe and all ramshackle collection boxes were replaced. The earthen reservoir was replaced with a concrete one.

Derby Center is ideally located for growth, but without the new water system it was not possible. Now, new homes have been built along the water lines. Two automobile dealerships have set up business in the village. The town has extended the water lines to a subdivision. A new shopping center is being built and another filling station is going up.

Derby Center's water system now serves 150 homes, two schools, and a number of commercial establishments. The cost per consumer is about $6 per month.

Forest Service. More than $400 million has been invested in expansion of the timber-based industries in Pennsylvania since 1965. Two industries accounting for part of the total selected their locations partly as a result of timber resource information provided by forest inventory specialists in the USDA Forest Service and the Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters. The Charmin Paper Products Company is located at Mehoopany, Pennsylvania, and the Masonite Corporation is at Towanda. Both mills have created important economic spinoffs for their areas.

The most impressive development has been creation of a low-cost housing and shopping center development at Russell Hill, Pennsylvania. Located mostly on abandoned farm lands, the development is designed especially to meet housing needs of the pulp and paper company employees who earn an average of $6,000 to $7,000 annually. Complete water and sewerage systems were built into the attractively planned development.

A second important development has been in the public highway system. A new bridge across the Susquehanna River was constructed at Mehoopany, eliminating a major bottleneck in the local transportation system. New road approaches in Mehoopany and at Russell Hill have made local highways safer to travel.

Two other mills are contributing to the State's economy by using pulpwood from the Northeastern Tier Economic Development District, a five-county District that also is a Resource Conservation and Development Project. This part of the State is part of the Appalachian Economic Development Region.

Rural Electrification Administration. North Dakota raises more than 50 percent of the Nation's barley, and 80 percent of the type used in malting, but it is refined and processed in the East. In February 1970, a Detroit firm announced plans to build a malting barley plant on a rural site near Wahpeton, North Dakota.

Playing a major role in the decision to locate the plant was a malting barley plant feasibility study done by North Dakota State University. It was funded by the Economic Development Administration, with assistance from the Basin Electric Power Cooperative, the Business and Industrial Development Department, and the National Malting Barley Growers Association.

Working with its borrower--Basin Electric--REA Development specialists helped the University prepare the background material to qualify for the EDA grant.

Another key factor in the decision was a water survey done by the State Water Commission. This study discovered, near Wahpeton, an underground reservoir of high quality water of ample quantity and proper temperature. The R.S.R. Electric Cooperative and the Central Power Electric Cooperative, along with other local organizations, helped the Commission with the study.

As a result of the studies, a number of maltsters are looking to North Dakota in planning future plant locations. The University, Basin Electric, and others are discussing conducting feasibility studies for the processing of other North Dakota raw materials, particularly durum wheat. The REA community development staff is assisting Basin Electric with this effort.

Soil Conservation Service. Catfish production in Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana, has been on the rise, thanks to the Soil Conservation Service. The increase in production has resulted in more income for farmers, a dependable source of raw fish, and fishout recreation ponds for the public.

Through the efforts of SCS, about 150 acres of water for catfish production have been constructed. This does not include the large number of livestock ponds being used for catfish production for recreation and home consumption.

The parish has 12 commercial catfish producers and at least 100 who produce for home use. The SCS has helped them with pond design, laycut, and construction. SCS technicians have also guided the producers in the biological aspects of fish production. Information through radio, newspapers, and person-to-person contact has made the general public aware of home-grown catfish. The producers cannot even satisfy local market demands.

Sponsors of the effort in Tangipahoa Parish are local farmers and other landowners through the Bogue Chitto-Pearl River Soil and Water Conservation District.

Benefits of the catfish production project include:

--an annual net profit to commercial producers averaging $250 per acre;

--300,000 pounds of fresh fish per year available to the public;

--200,000 pounds of fish produced for home use;

--construction of about $120,000 worth of commercial ponds (based on $800 per acre cost for 150 acres);

--about $70,000 spent on fish feed annually;

--intangible recreation benefits.

TABLE I

Status and Composition of USDA Committees on Rural Development at the State, Area, and County Levels of States

	State-USDA Rural Development Committee? (50)	Five Core USDA Agencies Represented? (49)	Other USDA Agencies Represented? (39)	Are State Agencies Represented? (37)	Other Units (than Extension) of LGU Represented (16)	Area-USDA Committees? (22)	Limited to Federal Agencies?(2)	State Agencies Represented?(14)	County-USDA Committees?(32)	Limited to Federal Agencies? (3)	State Agencies Represented?(17)	Are there County Government Representatives? (17)	Other Federal Agencies Represented? (13)
Alabama	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Alaska	✓	✓											
Arkansas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Arizona	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
California	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Colorado	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Connecticut	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Delaware	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Dist. of Col.													
Florida	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Hawaii	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Idaho	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Illinois	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Indiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Iowa	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Kansas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Kentucky	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Louisiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Maine	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Maryland	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Massachusetts	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Michigan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Mississippi	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Missouri	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Montana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Nebraska	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Nevada	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
New Hampshire	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
New Mexico	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
New York	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
North Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
North Dakota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Ohio	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Oregon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Pennsylvania	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Puerto Rico	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Rhode Island	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
South Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
South Dakota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Tennessee	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Texas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Utah	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Vermont	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Virgin Islands													
Washington	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
West Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Wisconsin	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Wyoming	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								

TABLE II

Agencies and Citizens Groups with Whom the USDA Committees on Rural Development have Established Working Relations at the State, Area, or County Levels.

	With State Development and/or Planning Agency? (41)	With State Citizens Development Committee? (22)	With Office of the Governor? (39)	With Area or District Planning Agencies? (34)	With Area Citizens Development Committees? (23)	With Councils of Government? (13)	With County Government Bodies? (32)	With County Citizens Development Committees? (30)	
Alabama	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	
Alaska	✓		✓						
Arkansas				✓					
Arizona	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
California									
Colorado	✓		✓	✓					
Connecticut	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Delaware		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Dist. of Col.									
Florida									
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Hawaii	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		
Idaho	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Illinois	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Indiana	✓			✓			✓	✓	
Iowa	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Kansas	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	
Kentucky	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Louisiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Maine	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	
Maryland	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Massachusetts	✓								
Michigan									
Minnesota			✓			✓	✓		
Mississippi	✓			✓				✓	
Missouri	✓		✓			✓			
Montana	✓	✓		✓	✓				
Nebraska	✓		✓	✓					
Nevada	✓					✓	✓		
New Hampshire			✓						
New Jersey									
New Mexico									
New York	✓	✓	✓	✓					
North Carolina	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
North Dakota	✓		✓		✓		✓		
Ohio	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
Oklahoma	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	
Oregon	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Pennsylvania	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓	
Puerto Rico	✓		✓	✓	✓			✓	
Rhode Island	✓		✓	✓			✓		
South Carolina			✓						
South Dakota	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Tennessee	✓		✓	✓			✓		
Texas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Utah	✓		✓	✓		✓			
Vermont	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Virgin Islands									
Washington	✓		✓				✓	✓	
West Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Wisconsin	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Wyoming	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	

TABLE III

Types of Needs and Concerns by State Which USDA-State Committees on Rural Development have Identified as Priority Items for Action.

	New Plants (14)	Job Training (10)	Industrial Expansion (13)	Service Industries (5)	Market Development (8)	Water and Sewage (17)	Health Care (11)	Recreation (16)	Housing (19)	Planning and/or Zoning (17)	Resource Inventories (6)	Multi-County Planning (15)	Transportation (2)	Tax Structures	Low Income Projects (13)	Educational Programs (11)
Alabama	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓				✓			✓
Alaska			✓													
Arkansas	✓															
Arizona																
California																
Colorado																
Connecticut									✓	✓						
Delaware		✓						✓	✓						✓	
Dist. of Col.															✓	
Florida																
Georgia	✓					✓										
Hawaii	✓	✓								✓		✓				
Idaho																
Illinois																
Indiana																
Iowa																
Kansas																
Kentucky	✓	✓				✓	✓									
Louisiana	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓			
Maine																
Maryland	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓				
Massachusetts				✓	✓				✓						✓	✓
Michigan																
Minnesota																
Mississippi							✓	✓							✓	
Missouri									✓	✓						
Montana										✓						
Nebraska																
Nevada																
New Hampshire																
New Jersey							✓									
New Mexico																
New York	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						
North Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	
North Dakota	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
Ohio						✓	✓	✓	✓						✓	
Oklahoma			✓			✓			✓							
Oregon	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓		✓					✓	
Pennsylvania	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	
Puerto Rico	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
Rhode Island																
South Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						
South Dakota				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							
Tennessee	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	
Texas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
Utah	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						
Vermont	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	
Virgin Islands																
Washington																
West Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓	
Wisconsin	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						
Wyoming																